IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD
(*Special Original Jurisdiction*)

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY SEVENTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND SIX

P R E S E N T

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

* * *

WP.No.26835 of 2006

Between:

AVL Suryanarayana Murthy, s/o. A. Subba Rao,
aged about 36 years, r/o. D.No. 12-207,
Sainagar, Gundala Veedhi, Thummapala (v),
Anakapalli, Visakhapatnam district. … Petitioner

Versus

A.P. Transmission Corporation,
Represented by its Chairman & Managing Director,
Vidyuthsoudha, Somajiguda,
Hyderabad & Ors. … Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioner: Dr.P.B. Vijay Kumar

Counsel for the Respondents: Sri Samineni Kishore
Standing Counsel for the Respondents.

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

W.P. No. 26835 of 2006

Oral order:

The petitioner states that the respondents issued Notification No.06/2006, inviting applications from eligible male candidates for filing up 1220 vacancies of Junior Lineman on yearly contract basis. Thereafter, the petitioner states that the respondents issued revised Notification No.09/2006, which according to the petitioner, had restricted the recruitment only to contract labour working through the contractors in the respective operation circles. The petitioner states that since the revised notification had restricted the recruitment only to candidates working as contract labour, and he not being a contract labour, is excluded from being considered.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents-AP TRANSCO.

I am unable to agree with the contention of the petitioner. The notification issued by the respondents for recruitment on contract basis for a period of one year is a general notification. However, to give preference to contract labour, the respondents have issued the revised notification. The revised notification, in no manner excludes the non-contract labour from applying or being considered. What all the revised notification states is that if the applicants satisfy the criteria for selection as provided in clauses (i) to (iii), preference will be given to those who have experience as contract labour as provided in clause (iv)(a) to (d). Merely because the revised notification had provided for giving preference to the contract labour already working through various contractors for the respondents, it cannot be said that the non-contract labour have been excluded from applying or being considered for selection. If the petitioner satisfies the criteria of selection, as provided in clauses (i) to (iii), he is always entitled to apply. Therefore, I find nothing wrong in the respondents issuing the revised notification.

There is no merit in the writ petition, and the same is accordingly dismissed.

N.V. RAMANA, J.

Date: 27th December, 2006.
ISL